

REMARKS

According to the Final Office Action, claims 1 – 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In response, to expedite the prosecution of the application and without conceding any statements or waiving any arguments in the Final Office Action, Applicant's claims are amended to remove the phrase "is configured to". Withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

Further according to the Final Office Action, claims 1-4, 8-9, 14, and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Yetter (USP 5,392,423) in view of Durham et al. (USP 5,964,866).

Further according to the Final Office Action, claims 5, 10-13, 15 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Yetter, Durham, and Singh et al. ("MOUSETRAP: Ultra-High-Speed Transition-Signaling Asynchronous Pipelines).

In response, among other things independent claims 1 and 17 are amended to incorporate features of claims 4 and 5, now canceled.

As stated in the previous responses to Office Actions, the synchronizing signals in Yetter are the clocks CK1 and CK2, which are inputs to the Yetter's mousetrap devices, and not output signals of these devices. As such, the applicants respectfully maintain that the combination of Yetter and Durham does not teach or suggest a device that includes a mousetrap buffer that includes a signaling output for coordinating data exchange between clocked device, and a synchronizer that synchronizes a change in the signalling output with a clock of one of the clocked devices, as specifically claimed in claim 1.

Furthermore, contrary to the Final Office Action, Durham fails to disclose Applicant's synchronizer as now recited in claim 1. Yetter and Singh don't cure this deficiency of Durham.

For at least the foregoing reasons, the combination of Durham, Yetter and Singh does not teach or suggest each and every feature of Applicants' claim 1. Hence, claim 1 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Independent claim 17 includes similar features as discussed hereinabove. For at least the same reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 17 is likewise patentable over the prior art of record.

Claims 2, 3 and 6-16 depend from claim 1. Each dependent claim includes at least the above mentioned features of claim 1, as well as additional distinguishing features. Therefore, claims 2, 3 and 6-16 are also patentable.

An earnest effort has been made to be fully responsive to the examiner's correspondence and advance the prosecution of this case. In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early notice thereof is earnestly solicited.

Please charge any additional fees associated with this application to Deposit Account No. 14-1270.

Respectfully submitted,

By /Larry Liberchuk/
Larry Liberchuk, Reg. No. 40,352
Senior IP Counsel